

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action dated July 16, 2007, claims 1 – 32 were rejected. In response, Applicants propose amending claims 1, 14, and 32. Applicants respectfully request that the proposed amendments be entered to put the claims in condition for allowance or to put the claims in better condition for appeal. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the below-provided remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 2, 5 – 15, and 18 – 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hama (U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2004/0202171 A1) in view of Ishizaki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,099,912 B2, hereinafter Ishizaki).

Claim 1

Applicants propose amending claim 1 to include the limitation “redefining the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs without having to redefine VLAN IDs that result in traffic being associated with the default service.” Support for this amendment is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, paragraph [0009]. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

“A method for managing network traffic comprising:
 explicitly identifying a set of virtual local area network (VLAN) identifiers (IDs) for use with a first service;
 receiving traffic from a customer at a provider edge device (PE), wherein said PE connects to other PEs via a tunnel-capable network;
 classifying said traffic;
 associating said traffic with said first service in response to said classification if said traffic has a VLAN ID from the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs;
 associating said traffic with a default service in response to said classification if said traffic does not have a VLAN ID from the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs; and
 redefining the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs without having to redefine VLAN IDs that result in traffic being associated with the default service.” (emphasis added)

Applicants assert that neither Hama nor Ishizaki teach or suggest the newly added limitation. In particular, Applicants assert that both Hama and Ishizaki teach that a set of

VLAN IDs that define a default service would have to be redefined if the set of VLAN IDs for a first (non-default) service were to be redefined. Because neither Hama nor Ishizaki teach or suggest “*redefining the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs without having to redefine VLAN IDs that result in traffic being associated with the default service*” as recited in amended claim 1, Applicants assert that amended claim 1 is not rendered obvious from Hama in view of Ishizaka.

Independent Claims 14 and 32

Applicants propose amending independent claims 14 and 32 to include similar limitations to claim 1. Although the language of claims 14 and 32 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claims 14 and 32 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 also apply to claims 14 and 32.

Independent Claim 23

Independent claim 23 recites in part “*extracting identified non-VPL traffic from said customer-specific VPL.*” The Final Office action does not specifically address where the prior art references teach or suggest extracting identified non-VPL traffic from a customer-specific VPL. Although the combination of Hama and Ishizaki teaches making VLAN-dependent forwarding decisions, Hama and Ishizaki make no reference to extracting identified non-VPL traffic from customer-specific VPL traffic.

Dependent Claims 2 – 13, 15 – 22, and 24 – 31

Claims 2 – 13 depend from claim 1, claims 15 – 22 depend from claim 14, and claims 24 – 31 depend from claim 23. Applicants assert that these claims are allowable at least based on an allowable base claim.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: September 14, 2007

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111